1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	JESUS ROMERO, a Minor, by and	CASE NO. 15cv815-GPC(MDD)
11	MERIDA RAMOS; MARCOS	
12	his Guardian ad Litem, MERIDA	ORDER GRANTING IN PART DEFENDANTS' EX PARTE MOTION TO MODIFY BRIEFING
13	JESUS ROMERO, a Minor, by and through his Guardian ad Litem, MERIDA RAMOS; MARCOS ROMERO, a Minor, by and through his Guardian ad Litem, MERIDA RAMOS; and PERLA ROMERO, a Minor, by and through her Guardian ad Litem, MERIDA RAMOS,	SCHEDULE ON THEIR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
14	Plaintiff,	[Dkt. No. 68.]
15	V.	[DKt. 140. 00.]
16		
17	MACY'S, INC., fka FEDERATED DEPARTMENT STORES, INC., a	
18	Delaware corporation; RALPH LAUREN CORPORATION, a	
19	Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, Inclusive,	
20	Defendant.	
21		
22	On June 29, 2016, Defendants Macy's Inc., Macy's West, Inc. and Ralph Lauren	
23	Corporation filed an ex parte motion to modify the Court's briefing schedule on their	
24	motion for summary judgment due to vacation plans. (Dkt. No. 68.) Plaintiffs filed	
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>	an opposition on June 30, 2016 arguing that Defendants failed to comply with Local	
27	Civil Rule 83.3(g) by failing to inform the opposing party of their ex parte request by	
28	affidavit or declaration. (Dkt. No. 70.) Plaintiffs also assert they are in the midst of	
20	discovery and have been in recent discussions with defense counsel concerning the	

Case 3:15-cv-00815-GPC-MDD Document 72 Filed 06/30/16 PageID.787 Page 1 of 2

scheduling of depositions and potentially extending discovery deadlines; however, 2 defense counsel did not mention that they intended to file a motion for summary 3 judgment. Despite their objection to defense counsel's conduct, Plaintiffs do not assert 4 they are unable to meet the deadlines shortening the time on briefing or that they seek 5 to extend any discovery deadlines. While the Court agrees with Plaintiffs that Defendants failed to comply with 6 Local Civil Rule 83.3(g)<sup>1</sup> by providing notice of the ex parte motion to Plaintiffs, for 7 purposes of efficiency, the Court GRANTS in part Defendants' ex parte application. 8 9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that any opposition to Defendants' 10 motion for summary judgment be filed on or before **August 12, 2016.** Any reply shall

IT IS SO ORDERED.

be filed on or before August 19, 2016.

1314

11

12

DATED: June 30, 2016

16

15

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

<sup>1</sup>Local Civil Rule 83.3(g) provides, "[a] motion for an order must not be made ex parte unless it appears by affidavit or declaration (1) that within a reasonable time before the motion the party informed the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney when and where the motion would be made; or (2) that the party in good faith attempted to inform the opposing party and the opposing party's attorney but was unable to do so, specifying the efforts made to inform them; or (3) that for reasons specified the party should not be required to inform the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney."

United States District Judge

252627

28